DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 784 TM 850 241

TITLE	Achievement Goals Program Report of Findings, Staff Survey: 1983-1984. Evaluation Services Department Report No. 366.
INSTITUTION	San Diego City Schools, CA. Planning, Research and Evaluation Div.
PUB DATE	18 Sep 84
NOTE	59p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Mathematics Instruction; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Reading Instruction; School Districts; School Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	*Achievement Goals Program; *San Diego Unified School District CA

ABSTRACT

The implementation evaluation of the Achievement Goals Program (AGP) included a survey of program users. This report presents the findings of that survey conducted in 1984. The users included teachers, resource teachers, and site administrators. The AGP was first initiated by the San Diego City Schools to meet the demands of the court. The Evaluation Department considers input from the program managers, site principals, and board members prior to developing the survey each year. The 33 item survey uses a Likert Scale response ranging from positive to negative. The survey assesses overall perceptions, AGP Additions or Revisions, and Technical Assistance. The appendices include the AGP Survey Instrument and Answer Sheet, General Comments by Elementary and Secondary Respondents, and Comments by Item. The primary audience for this report is program and district staff. (DWH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

L1

San Diego City Schools

EVALUATION SERVICES DEPARTMENT REPORT

ED256784

ACHIEVEMENT GOALS PROGRAM

REPORT OF FINDINGS

STAFF SURVEY: 1983 - 1984

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. S. Hatcher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

No. 366

September 18, 1984

FLANNING, RESEARCH AND EVALUATION DIVISION

ACHIEVEMENT GOALS PROGRAM REPORT OF FINDINGS
STAFF SURVEY: 1983 - 1984

September 18, 1984

Evaluation Department
Elizabeth A. Tomblin, Ph.D.,
Associate Director
Stephen Isaac, Ph.D.,
Director
Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Dean H. Nafziger, Ph.D.
Assistant to the Superintendent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Index of Tables	v
Index of Appendices	vii
Executive Summary	ix
I. ISSUE/CONCERN	1
II. BACKGROUND	1
III. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	3
Survey Description	3
Findings: Overview of Tables 1, 2, 3, & 4	3
Findings: Overall Perceptions	5
Findings: Suggestions for Additions or Revisions	9
Findings: Technical Assistance	9
Findings: Resource Teacher and Administrator Responses	9
Findings: Perception Changes with Years of Use	10
Findings: Respondents' Comments	10
IV. CONCLUSIONS	12
V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE PROGRAM	13
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE BOARD OF EDUCATION	13

INDEX OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Mean Responses of Teachers by Grade Levels and Subject Areas	2
2.	Mean Responses of Resource Teachers and Administrators	4
3.	Frequency and Percent of Respondents Making Each Choice	6
4.	Mean Responses by Years of Use	8

INDEX OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
A.	AGP Survey Instrument and Answer Sheet	A-1
B.	General Comments by Elementary and Secondary Respondents	B-1
C.	Comments by Item	C-1

ACHIEVEMENT GOALS PROGRAM REPORT OF FINDINGS
STAFF SURVEY: 1983 - 84

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue/Concern:

In 1983-84, implementation evaluation of the Achievement Goals Program (AGP) consisted of a survey of the opinions of the users of that program: the teachers, resource teachers and site administrators. Individual items and/or sections of the survey address interests expressed by board members, teachers and teachers' groups, site administrators, and leaders in the Educational Services Division. This report presents the findings of that survey, conducted in the Spring of 1984.

Conclusions

1. Overall, the results of the survey of the Achievement Goals Program are positive. Most items received mean responses of well over 3.00 on a 5.00 scale. Since the survey was developed to examine specific questions from the AGP leadership, to address program improvements and concerns of board members and others, the results should be reassuring and satisfying to those audiences.

2. Some items receiving low responses, when combined with the comments, point the way for program improvement. This is best illustrated by the items pertaining to the Spanish AGP and a need for revision. Item responses and comments in relation to the secondary English program tend to indicate a need for redirection and revision in that area.

3. Some items receiving low responses may be in areas that go beyond AGP itself. Those items which questioned whether or not elementary teachers feel better about the time available for art, music, science, and social studies received low ratings. Extension of the school day may help that situation; inservice on how to build those subjects into other areas of AGP may help also.

4. The survey was initiated by the AGP staff. Their questions and concerns were assembled with items of interest to the Board and managers from other program areas. The results of the survey combined with norm referenced test data tend to show that the Achievement Goals Program is accomplishing its intended results and that those people implementing the curriculum have confidence in the program. Modifications have been well received and areas of weakness are being corrected.

Recommendations for the Program:

The following recommendations can be made for the program at this time:

1. Study the results of this survey in conjunction with other studies which have been carried out, e.g. the interviews of English Department chairpersons in relation to the English program at the secondary level and the pilot study of teachers using the English program at grades 9-10.

2. Address the deficiencies of the Spanish AGP.

3. Disseminate the results of this survey in order to relay the message of an overall finding of positive regard of the Achievement Goals Program. AGP fall inservice meetings should be used to insure that teachers and aides become aware of the results. The Staff Bulletin could be used to inform non-AGP personnel of the positive perceptions documented by this study. Interested audiences should also be assured that corrective action is being taken in areas of weaknesses.

Recommendations for the Board of Education:

The primary audience for this report is program and district staff. There are no Board recommendations connected with this report.

I.
ISSUE/CONCERN

In 1983-84, implementation evaluation of the Achievement Goals Program consisted of a survey of the opinions of the users of that program: the teachers, resource teachers and site administrators. The survey was initiated by the AGP staff. However, some items of the survey address interests expressed by board members, teachers and teachers' groups, site administrators, and leaders in the Educational Services Division. This report presents the findings of that survey, conducted in the Spring of 1984.

II.
BACKGROUND

When the Achievement Goals Program was first initiated by the District to meet the demands of the court, summative test score information and implementation evaluation designs were presented to the court. Surveys have been an important part of the implementation evaluation each year, providing teachers and administrators a chance to voice their opinions and suggestions, providing the leaders of the AGP information from which to improve the program, and providing the board and court with an indicator of the degree of success and acceptance of the program in addition to the student test scores. In early years, parent surveys and student surveys were included. As needed in some years, follow-up interviews have been used to clarify survey responses and gather additional information.

Program leaders have used the information from surveys. Revisions have been made to improve the program based on the input from teachers, administrators and the resource teachers. Monthly meetings have been held and problem-solving groups set up to allow teachers and principals to assist in improving the program.

In the first few years, revisions to the initial parts of the program comprised the main targets for improvement. In more recent years, attention has been given to the new grade levels receiving AGP, and revisions have been more refining than extensive. Not only have new schools and levels been added to AGP each year, but new elements have been added to the curriculum; refinements of existing elements have occurred; and new concerns have been addressed as they emerge. Some similar items appear in the surveys, but each year new items or sections appear to reflect concerns or issues during that particular year and the particular phase of the program. Each year, the Evaluation Department receives input from the program managers, site principals, and board members prior to developing the survey.

TABLE 1

ACHIEVEMENT GOALS PROGRAM
Staff Questionnaire 1983 - 84

MEAN RESPONSES OF TEACHERS
BY GRADE LEVELS AND SUBJECT AREA

BEST COPY

ITEM DESCRIPTION*	All Elementary Teachers	All Secondary Teachers	Secondary Math Teachers	Secondary Reading Teachers	Secondary Language Teachers	Total** Respondents
Overall Perceptions						
A. AGP as a superior program:						
-In Reading (26)	3.35	2.95	-	2.92	-	3.42
-In Language (27)	3.21	2.60	-	-	2.69	3.24
-In Math (28)	3.61	3.34	3.26	-	-	3.67
B. Positive change of perception re value of AGP (7)	3.87	3.38	3.32	3.34	3.21	3.84
C. Extent of disagreement with AGP as a remedial program (25)	3.63	3.31	3.27	3.46	3.22	3.64
D. Extent to which AGP provides:						
-Time for application of learning (3)	2.98	3.14	3.16	3.24	3.00	3.12
-Practice & application of "thinking" skills (23)	2.93	2.87	2.67	3.00	3.02	3.01
E. Extent to which more time was available this year for:						
-Science, social studies, & health (16)	2.42	-	-	-	-	2.49
-Fine & applied arts (17)	2.28	-	-	-	-	2.33
F. Degree to which expectations of students' progress increased (10)	3.80	3.23	3.24	3.21	3.22	3.74
G. Effect on teacher/student rapport (2)	3.30	3.22	3.29	3.23	3.10	3.35
H. Extension materials:						
-Percentage of students using (8)	2.98	2.82	2.64	2.98	2.94	2.95
-Frequency of use (9)	3.07	3.22	3.26	3.20	3.16	3.12
AGP Additions or Revisions						
I. English/Language Arts:						
-Satisfaction w/lowered-readability worksheets, gr. 4-6 (21)	3.62	-	-	-	-	3.71
-Degree to which Language Lead-ups, gr. 1-6, are essential (22)	2.67	-	-	-	-	2.88
J. Spanish AGP Revisions:						
-Degree of satisfaction w/English LA materials (18)	2.90	3.31	-	3.00	3.50	3.10
-Further English/LA revisions unnecessary (19)	2.00	2.64	-	1.86	3.67	2.29
-Further Math revisions unnecessary (20)	2.72	3.00	3.17	-	-	2.80
Technical Assistance						
K. Extent apprised of options for creativity/innovation (1)	3.52	3.78	3.82	3.79	3.69	3.70
L. Degree to which:						
-Resource teachers are essential (4)	4.02	3.73	3.74	3.91	3.52	4.04
-AGP site substitutes are essential (5)	3.88	3.19	3.26	3.53	-	3.86
-Principals are essential as instructional leaders (6)	3.33	3.40	3.35	3.55	3.32	3.50
-AGP aides are essential (24)	4.41	4.42	4.39	4.50	4.37	4.45
M. Frequency of program implementation feedback from:						
-Principal (12)	3.96	2.99	2.91	3.20	2.89	3.76
-Resource teacher (13)	4.21	3.36	3.23	3.57	3.33	4.02
N. Frequency of classroom visits by principal (11)	3.41	2.84	2.56	3.27	2.82	3.30
O. Perception of principal's level of:						
-Expectation for AGP success (14)	4.43	4.20	4.23	4.24	4.11	4.41
-Support for AGP program (15)	4.46	4.00	3.97	4.12	3.92	4.38
Number Responding (N)***	459	147	62	43	42	690
MEAN RATING FOR TOTAL RESPONDING						3.53

* Number in parentheses indicates question number on AGP Survey.
** Includes Administrators and resource teachers.
*** Any given item (N) may be smaller than the total N because of the exclusivity of the questions.

III.
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Results of the survey are presented in tables. Findings are discussed in summary narrative. Whereas the program people or various audiences may want to study the responses to particular items or from specific groups in much detail, the intent of this report is to provide a reasonably brief summary of the overall results.

Survey Description

The thirty-three item survey uses a Likert Scale response in which 5 is a highly positive response, 1 represents the most negative response, and responses below 3 are considered negative. Some items were answered by all respondents, others by a particular group. For instance, all respondents replied to items concerning overall perceptions of AGP, while few teachers were required to respond to items concerned with revision of the Spanish AGP language arts materials. Some items measure level of agreement while others measure frequencies. Item 29 is an either/or choice; Items 30-33 only required responses by resource teachers and administrators because they deal with factors which are a step removed from the involvement of the teachers. A copy of the complete survey with instructions for completing it and the answer sheet are attached as Appendix A.

Findings: Overview of Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4

In constructing the tables showing the survey's results, items are grouped by pertinent divisions: Overall Perceptions, AGP Additions or Revisions, and Technical Assistance. Subgroups appear under these headings. Tables show the results by groups of respondents--teachers, resource teachers, and administrators--by programs and by years in AGP.

Table 1, page 2, shows the results for Items 1-28 of the survey for all teachers and for total respondents. The column entitled "Total Respondents" includes teachers, resource teachers and administrators, so total respondents exceeds the sum of the teacher columns. Teacher responses are separated by elementary and secondary, and secondary are further subdivided according to subject area taught by the teacher. Where blanks occur, no response is requested or intended by that group.

Table 2, page 4, shows the responses of resource teacher and administrator to the survey. Elementary resource teacher responses are separated into English and Spanish program respondents; secondary by junior and senior high respondents; and administrators by each school level division. The administrator

TABLE 2
ACHIEVEMENT GOALS PROGRAM
Staff Questionnaire 1983-84

BEST COPY

MEAN RESPONSES OF RESOURCE TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

ITEM DESCRIPTION*	Elementary Resource Teachers English	Elementary Resource Teachers Spanish	Secondary Resource Teachers Jr. High	Secondary Resource Teachers Sr. High	Administrators Elem.	Administrators Jr. Hi	Administrators Sr. Hi
Overall Perceptions			Mean Responses				
A. AGP as a superior program:							
-In Reading (26)	4.63	4.00	4.00	4.67	4.48	3.50	3.75
-In Language (27)	4.16	4.00	4.20	3.67	4.14	3.25	3.75
-In Math (28)	4.88	4.00	4.40	5.00	4.50	3.75	3.75
B. Positive change of perception re value of AGP (7)	4.61	4.80	4.80	4.00	4.57	4.75	4.25
C. Extent of disagreement with AGP as a remedial program (25)	4.74	4.75	4.40	4.00	4.45	3.50	3.25
D. Extent to which AGP provides:							
-Time for application of learning (3)	4.19	4.00	4.75	4.50	4.14	4.00	4.00
-Practice & application of "thinking" skills (23)	4.00	4.25	3.60	4.00	3.85	2.00	3.75
E. Extent to which more time was available this year for:							
-Science, social studies, & health (16)	2.89	2.67	-	-	2.75	-	-
-Fine & applied arts (17)	3.12	2.67	-	-	2.57	-	-
F. Degree to which expectations of students' progress increased (10)	4.44	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.68	4.50	3.67
G. Effect on teacher/student rapport (2)	4.00	4.20	5.00	3.50	4.39	4.50	4.00
H. Extension materials:							
-Percentage of students using (8)	2.75	3.00	5.00	2.00	3.60	4.00	3.00
-Frequency of use (9)	3.37	[illegible]	4.00	4.00	3.33	3.50	3.00
AGP Additions or Revisions							
I. English/Language Arts:							
-Satisfaction w/lowered-readability worksheets, gr. 4-6 (21)	4.00	5.00	-	-	4.37	4.00	-
-Degree to which Language Lead-ups, gr. 1-6, are essential (22)	4.21	[illegible].00	-	-	4.14	-	-
J. Spanish AGP Revisions:							
-Degree of satisfaction w/English LA materials (18)	3.50	4.00	4.00	-	3.56	4.00	3.00
-Further English/LA revisions unnecessary (19)	2.67	2.50	4.00	-	3.11	4.00	4.00
-Further Math revisions unnecessary (20)	2.75	3.00	2.50	-	3.12	2.50	3.00
Technical Assistance							
K. Extent apprised of options for creativity/innovation (1)	4.68	4.60	5.00	5.00	4.81	4.67	4.25
L. Degree to which:							
-Resource teachers are essential (4)	4.94	5.00	5.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00
-AGP site substitutes are essential (5)	4.77	5.00	4.25	3.50	5.00	4.25	4.50
-Principals are essential as instructional leaders (6)	4.63	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.78	4.25	4.75
-AGP aides are essential (24)	4.83	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.50	4.75
-Central AGP personnel are essential (30)	5.00	4.80	4.00	4.67	4.83	4.75	4.75
-Central curriculum development personnel are essential (31)	4.90	4.80	3.50	5.00	4.75	4.25	4.75
M. Frequency of program implementation feedback from:							
-Principal (12)	3.40	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.62	4.00	4.50
-Resource teacher (13)	4.75	4.33	5.00	-	4.86	5.00	4.50
N. Frequency of classroom visits by principal (11)	3.60	3.50	4.00	2.50	4.11	4.00	4.00
O. Perception of principal's level of:							
-Expectation for AGP success (14)	4.42	5.00	4.50	4.67	5.00	5.00	4.67
-Support for AGP program (15)	4.56	4.75	4.60	4.67	4.87	5.00	5.00
P. Usefulness of Concept-Cluster Analysis information (33)	4.32	4.20	3.00	4.33	4.08	3.75	3.00
Q. Reliability of services of Central staff dispensing AGP materials (32)	4.90	4.40	4.50	5.00	4.43	3.75	4.75
Number Responding (N)**	20	5	5	3	24	4	4

* Number in parentheses indicates question number on AGP Survey.
** Any given item (N) may be smaller than the total because of the exclusivity of the questions.

category includes both principals and vice principals who are knowledgeable about the program. In some secondary schools, a vice principal may not be working closely with the program.

Table 3, page 6, gives the frequency of responses to each option, 1 through 5. In the interpretation of surveys, means give a convenient way to determine ratings and relative ratings of items. It is often important to know the distribution of responses, so that a frequency chart such as Table 3 is helpful.

Table 4, page 8, displays responses from all survey participants by years of use of AGP.

Findings: Overall Perceptions

The mean rating for everyone responding to all items is 3.53 on a scale of 5. However, each item should be examined individually, noting respondent and response.

Elementary teachers gave positive responses for reading, language and math components of AGP, but secondary teachers responded positively on the average only to math. For secondary teachers, the reading program was just below three and language rating lower (2.60). A separate study in which all English Department Chairs at the secondary level were interviewed has been conducted during the Spring of 1984, and results are given in Report No. 368, Interviews of Department Chairpersons, English Language Program, 7-10, Total respondents gave positive ratings to all three subject areas. As in past surveys, principals and resource teachers tend to respond slightly more positively on AGP survey items than classroom teachers. This difference appears in a comparison of Tables 1 and 2.

All groups of respondents indicate that their perceptions of AGP have become more positive the longer they experienced the program. Table 4 further defines these findings. A majority of respondents (58%) disagree that AGP is a remedial program. Mean responses are only slightly positive for items asking the extent to which AGP provides for practice and application of "thinking" skills and time for application of learning, but with 70% and 67%, respectively, giving a rating of 3 or higher on these items.

A complaint over the years by elementary teachers is that with the AGP curricular emphasis on math, reading and language, there is little time left for social studies, art, music and science. That perception still exists with close to half of the respondents, and the mean responses to those questions are less than 2.5. Examination of the frequency of responses by elementary teachers who answered the questions reveals that just under half of the respondents replied positively with a 3 or better, and about half responded negatively. Elementary resource teachers and elementary administrators also gave average ratings of less than 3 on these items.

BEST COPY

TABLE 3
ACHIEVEMENT GOALS PROGRAM
Staff Questionnaire 1983 - 1984

FREQUENCY & PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS
MAKING EACH CHOICE

ITEM DESCRIPTION		Most Negative Choice 1	Choice 2	Choice 3	Choice 4	Most Positive Choice 5	Total Respond.	Mean Value
Overall Perceptions								
A. AGP as a superior program: -In Reading (26)	#	50	75	147	150	128	550	3.42
	%	9	14	27	27	23		
-In Language (27)	#	58	89	166	138	100	551	3.24
	%	11	16	30	25	18		
-In Math (28)	#	32	68	137	168	178	583	3.67
	%	5	12	24	29	31		
B. Positive change of perception re value of AGP (7)	#	32	51	152	204	239	678	3.84
	%	5	8	22	30	35		
C. AGP not a remedial progr[illegible] (25)	#	67	66	143	148	240	664	3.64
	%	10	10	22	22	36		
D. Extent to which AGP provides: -Time for application of learning (3)	#	78	145	166	175	104	668	3.12
	%	12	22	25	26	16		
-Practice & application of "thinking" skills (23)	#	104	94	224	162	72	656	3.01
	%	16	14	34	25	11		
E. Extent to which more time was available this year for: -Science, social studies, & health (16)	#	152	91	117	81	36	477	2.49
	%	32	19	25	17	8		
-Fine & applied arts (17)	#	161	97	111	67	22	458	2.33
	%	35	21	24	15	5		
F. Degree to which expectations of students' progress increased (10)	#	26	44	197	211	190	668	3.74
	%	4	7	29	32	28		
G. Effect on teacher/student rapport (2)	#	40	87	261	150	123	661	3.35
	%	6	13	39	23	19		
H. Extension materials: -Percentage of students using (8)	#	128	116	146	137	102	629	2.95
	%	20	18	23	22	16		
-Frequency of use (9)	#	117	88	135	162	116	618	3.12
	%	19	14	22	26	19		
AGP Additions or Revisions								
I. English/Language Arts: -Satisfaction w/lowered-readability worksheets, gr. 4-6 (21)	#	13	11	42	47	54	167	3.71
	%	8	7	25	28	32		
-Degree to which Language Lead-ups, grade 1-6, are essential (22)	#	67	42	79	53	45	286	2.89
	%	23	15	28	19	16		
J. Spanish AGP Revisions: -Degree of satisfaction w/English/ LA Materials (18)	#	23	17	32	34	21	127	3.10
	%	18	13	25	27	17		
-Further English/LA revisions unnecessary (19)	#	59	14	17	16	15	121	2.29
	%	49	12	14	13	12		
-Further Math revisions unnecessary (20)	#	42	12	20	26	23	123	2.80
	%	34	10	16	21	19		

BEST COPY

TABLE 3, Cont'd.
ACHIEVEMENT GOALS PROGRAM
Staff Questionnaire 1983 - 84

FREQUENCY & PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS
MAKING EACH CHOICE

ITEM DESCRIPTION		Most Negative Choice 1	Choice 2	Choice 3	Choice 4	Most Positive Choice 5	Total Respond.	Mean Value
Technical Assistance								
K. Extent apprised of options for creativity/innovation (1)	#	54	76	143	159	244	670	3.A
	%	8	10	21	24	36		
L. Degree to which:								
-Resource teachers are essential (4)	#	46	67	74	107	371	665	4.04
	%	7	10	11	16	56		
-AGP site substitutes are essential (5)	#	42	27	79	86	198	432	3.86
	%	10	6	18	20	46		
-Principals are essential as instructional leaders (6)	#	107	56	140	131	239	673	3.50
	%	16	8	21	19	36		
-AGP aides are essential (24)	#	26	16	54	88	452	636	4.45
	%	4	3	8	14	71		
M. Frequency of program implementation feedback from:								
-Principal (12)	#	106	42	66	63	325	602	3.76
	%	18	7	11	10	54		
-Resource teacher (13)	#	72	32	46	76	337	563	4.02
	%	13	6	8	14	60		
N. Frequency of classroom visits by principal (11)	#	97	110	113	108	190	618	3.30
	%	16	18	18	17	31		
O. Perceptions of principal's level of								
-Expectation for AGP success (14)	#	9	13	80	158	405	665	4.41
	%	1	2	12	24	61		
-Support for AGP program (15)	#	16	21	79	123	422	661	4.38
	%	2	3	12	19	64		
Pre-school Inservice Preference								
Site (choice 1) or district (choice 2) (29)	#	443	204				647	
	%	68	32					

TABLE 4
ACHIEVEMENT GOALS PROGRAM
Staff Questionnaire 1983 - 84

MEAN RESPONSES BY YEARS OF USE

BEST COPY

ITEM DESCRIPTION *	One Year	Two Year	Three Year	Four Year	Total Responses
			Mean Responses		
Overall Perceptions					
A. AGP as a superior program:					
-In Reading (26)	3.14 (N=94)**	3.24 (N=85)	3.51	3.49	3.42
-In Language (27)	3.08 (N=90)	3.04 (N=91)	3.30	3.33	3.24
-In Math (28)	3.20	3.57 (N=70)	3.79	3.87	3.67
B. Positive change of perception re value of AGP (7)	3.61	3.77	3.93	4.00	3.84
C. Extent of disagreement with AGP as a remedial program (25)	3.30	3.58	3.82	3.79	3.64
D. Extent to which AGP provides:					
-Time for application of learning (3)	2.95	3.03	3.24	3.07	3.12
-Practice & application of "thinking" skills (23)	2.95	2.78	3.11	3.02	3.01
E. Extent to which more time was available this year for:					
-Science, social studies, & health (16)	2.21 (N=73)	2.67 (N=75)	2.57 (N=165)	2.37	2.49
-Fine & applied arts (17)	2.06 (N=70)	2.23 (N=71)	2.47 (N=156)	2.26	2.33
F. Degree to which expectations of students' progress increased (10)	3.44	3.63	3.80	3.94	3.74
G. Effect on teacher/student rapport (2)	3.19	3.19	3.45	3.41	3.35
H. Extension materials:					
-Percentage of students using (8)	2.83	2.95	2.99	3.01	2.95
-Frequency of use (9)	3.01	3.14	3.19	3.06	3.12
AGP Additions or Revisions					
I. English/Language Arts:					
-Satisfaction w/lowered-readability worksheets, gr. 4-6 (21)	3.58 (N=26)	3.42 (N=19)	3.91 (N=53)	3.75 (N=51)	3.71
-Degree to which Language Lead-ups, gr. 1-6, are essential (22)	3.18 (N=34)	3.00 (N=41)	2.83 (N=101)	2.67 (N=38)	2.88
J. Spanish AGP Revisions:					
-Degree of satisfaction w/English LA materials (18)	3.12 (N=16)	3.11 (N=18)	3.03 (N=38)	3.02 (N=41)	3.10
-Further English/LA revisions unnecessary (19)	2.11 (N=19)	2.62 (N=16)	2.62 (N=37)	1.87 (N=38)	2.29
-Further Math revisions unnecessary (20)	2.95 (N=19)	3.38 (N=13)	2.92 (N=39)	2.26 (N=42)	2.80
Technical Assistance					
K. Extent apprised of options for creativity/innovation (1)	3.24	3.75	3.83	3.82	3.70
L. Degree to which:					
-Resource teachers are essential (4)	3.84	3.83	4.15	4.15	4.04
-Site substitutes are essential (5)	3.60 (N=63)	3.65 (N=79)	3.90 (N=125)	4.05	3.86
-Principals are essential as instructional leaders (6)	3.04	3.59	3.54	3.70	3.50
-AGP aides are essential (24)	4.42	4.29	4.51	4.50	4.45
M. Frequency of program implementation feedback from:					
-Principal (12)	3.03	3.55	4.04	4.19	3.76
-Resource teacher (13)	3.38 (N=107)	3.79	4.28	4.33	4.02
N. Frequency of classroom visits by principal (11)	2.78	3.11	3.57	3.50	3.30
O. Perception of principal's level of:					
-Expectation for AGP success (14)	4.37	4.32	4.38	4.58	4.41
-Support for AGP program (15)	4.16	4.31	4.47	4.54	4.38
Number Responding (N)***	146	118	215	159	638

* Number in parentheses indicates question number on AGP Survey.
** N's which vary by more than 20% from total N are listed.
*** Any given item (N) may be smaller than the total N because of the exclusivity of the questions.

A wide variation exists regarding the use of extension materials. Roughly twenty percent or less indicated each range of percentages given (0-19%, 20-39%, 40-59%, etc.). The same variation exists when teachers were asked in what percent of the units students can progress to the extension materials. Looking at the mean response, one would say that 40-60% of the students are able to take advantage of the extension materials. In actuality, there is quite a variation among classes.

Findings: Suggestions for Additions or Revisions

The need for Spanish AGP revisions is indicated by the 125 respondents, with the elementary respondents indicating a stronger need than secondary. The lowered readability worksheets for the English/Language Arts Program, Grades 4-6 appear to be satisfactory. The Language Lead-ups* for Grades 1-6 are not considered essential if the mean of 2.67 is the gauge. Roughly a third rated the lead-ups non-essential, a third gave a middle rating of "3", and a third rated them essential to the program.

Findings: Technical Assistance

Responses to items under technical assistance, and particularly those related to support services received the highest ratings of the three sections. Most items received mean responses well over 3.5, with many as high as 4.00.

The item which consistently received the highest response is the one indicating that the AGP aides are essential. Those items receiving the next highest response are two which rated perceptions of the principal's level of expectation for AGP success and principal's support for the AGP program. The high response to the frequency of program implementation feedback from the AGP resource teacher may account for much of the success of AGP: regular feedback from resource teacher to classroom teachers insures a high quality implementation.

Findings: Resource Teacher and Administrator Responses

Resource teachers and administrators hold a very positive view of the program. Further, their views seem to correlate highly with the teachers' views: items which had low teacher responses also had low resource teacher and administrator responses.

---

* Language Lead-ups are simple, brief, five-minute exercises illustrating a single principle of language; they are patterned after the Word Warm-ups which proved so successful

Four items were addressed to only resource teachers and administrators. Each of the items received a very positive response. The Central office leadership and curriculum development personnel are considered essential. Central office staff who are dispensing AGP materials are giving reliable service. Concept Cluster Analysis has been helpful to the schools. (See Table 2).

Findings: Perception Changes with Years of Use

Table 4 shows that perceptions of AGP become consistently more positive with each year of use from the first through third years, with some leveling at the fourth year. These data say in effect that the more teachers and administrators use and understand the program, the more they like it and what it accomplishes.

Findings: Respondents' Comments

Respondents were encouraged to use space provided on the answer sheets to make comments. Where possible, comments were tied to specific items by numbering the comments the same as the item. Of 690 answer sheets returned, 112 respondents made comments. In analyzing the comments, it was possible to classify most of the comments as positive or negative. Those who write comments tend to be motivated to explain negative responses and, therefore, tend to write negative comments in order to explain the problem. Of the comments made by elementary teachers, sixty were clearly negative; twenty-four were clearly positive. Some comments simply asked questions or made neutral points. Of the comments made by secondary personnel, about 70% or 75% were negative.

Comments help clarify responses to survey items and answer the question, "Why do we get these responses?" Secondly, comments convey a sense of the feelings of respondents. Many of the comments offered were, clearly, strongly felt. Comments are essential in keeping survey results in perspective and those who want to understand the results of the survey will find the comments in Appendices B and C. In Appendix B, the general comments are divided by elementary and by secondary respondents. In Appendix C, comments are divided by the number of the item to which they refer, to the extent possible.

Following are some overall impressions suggested by the comments:

- Some teachers continue to feel that AGP is a restrictive program which limits creativity and innovation. Teachers reported that they were apprised of their options but that those options are really limited by other elements of the program: pacing schedule, sequencing of units, and administrative procedures for on site changes of the program.

- There is the feeling among some teachers that the resource teacher at the site spends too much time doing administrative/distributive detail

and wastes expertise which could be used in the classroom. Others picture the resource teacher "...as my right arm: Remove my right arm and I still function but not to the degree I would with a right arm."

- Teachers view the site-stationed substitute teacher as a grand idea but report that they are seldom fortunate enough to be replaced by such a teacher when absent.

- Comments relative to the principal and site resource teacher being instructional leaders tend to favor the site resource teacher, assigning the need for support of the principal in other areas. Comments would indicate that more teachers would like to see the principal in the classroom, demonstrating her/his skill in carrying out AGP.

- The diversity of answers to Survey Item 7: "Since beginning instruction of the program, how have your views of AGP changed?" illustrates how wrong it is to accept survey numerical data too simplistically. The quantitative response to that question is very favorable; however, the comments reveal that there is a diversity of opinion on the subject. One teacher, for instance, felt that math AGP is very good but has become convinced that AGP reading "builds in a dislike of reading--regardless of 'scores' which are not education; but we teach for tests & ignore the needs of slower learning children." Many teachers indicated a feeling that tests have become more important than is educationally healthy.

- Some teachers felt that they are observed by the principal for the wrong things in relation to AGP: starting on time, being at the right place in the pacing schedule, etc. As one teacher said, "Please, please, observe me for: my teaching techniques, my relationships with students, the progress of my students in relation to their ability, the 'feeling' you get when in my classroom....Please check my results--not my pacing charts!"

- Comments help clarify results of items which receive low ratings. Teacher responses to Survey Item 17 would indicate that they were really not able to improve the time allocated to music, art, and/or applied arts this year. The comments give some reasons why: the language program is taking more time; some teachers feel they have a different kind of student which requires that more time be spent in reading, math, and language; some have bilingual self-contained classes requiring more time. For others there is ample time " 'even' with AGP!! I really feel it is a myth, propagated largely (but not entirely) by poor management, that AGP affords no time for the arts...."

- The comments to Items 18, 19, and 20 will help resource personnel understand what must be done for the AGP Spanish curriculum.

- "How essential are the AGP aides in carrying out the program?" received

the highest response of any item on the survey; it also received the most comments. The comments help explain why the aide is looked upon as being so essential. The comments also show that there are classrooms which have no aide and in which they would be appreciated very much.

IV.
CONCLUSIONS

1. Overall, the results of the survey of the Achievement Goals Program are positive. Most items received mean responses of well over 3.00 on a 5.00 scale. Since the survey was developed to examine specific questions from AGP leadership, to address program improvements and concerns of board members and others, the results should be reassuring and satisfying to those audiences.

2. Some items receiving low responses, when combined with the comments, point the way for program improvement. This is best illustrated by the items pertaining to the Spanish AGP and a need for revision. Item responses and comments in relation to the secondary English program tend to indicate a need for redirection and revision in that area.

3. Some items receiving low responses may be in areas that go beyond AGP itself. Those items which questioned whether or not elementary teachers feel better about the time available for art, music, science, and social studies received low ratings. Extension of the school day may help that situation; inservice on how to build those subjects into other areas of AGP may help.

4. The survey was initiated by the Achievement Goals Program staff. Their questions and concerns were assembled with items of interest to the Board and managers from other program areas. The results of the survey combined with norm referenced test data tend to show that the Achievement Goals Program is accomplishing its intended results and that those people implementing the curriculum have confidence in the program. Modifications have been well received and areas of weakness are being corrected.

V.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE PROGRAM

The following recommendations can be made for the program at this time:

1. Study the results of this survey in conjunction with other studies which have been carried out, e.g. the interviews of English Department chairpersons in relation to the English program at the secondary level and the pilot study of teachers using the English program at grades 9-10.

2. Address the deficiencies of the Spanish AGP.

3. Disseminate the results of this survey in order to relay the message of an overall finding of positive regard of the Achievement Goals Program. AGP fall inservice meetings should be used to insure that teachers and aides become aware of the results. The Staff Bulletin could be used to inform non-AGP personnel of the positive perceptions documented by this study. Interested audiences should also be assured that corrective action is being taken in areas of weaknesses.

VI.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

The primary audience for this report is program and district staff. There are no Board recommendations connected with this report.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

AGP Survey Instrument and Answer Sheet

BEST COPY

A G P SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS

1. Teachers: Location Number--In the section labeled "IDENTIFICATION," choose the three digits from below to identify your site location and put the number in boxes 1, 2, and 3. Blacken the corresponding numbered circles beneath those three numbers.

ELEMENTARY

Loc. #	School	Loc. #	School	Loc. #	School
005	Anderson	063	Chollas	164	Kennedy
007	Angier	077	Curie	165	Knox
009	Audubon	078	Dailard	173	Linda Vista
011	Baker	091	Emerson	177	Logan
013	Balboa	095	Euclid	185	Lowell
031	Birney	115	Freese	205	Mead
033	Boone	119	Fulton	237	Perry
037	Brooklyn	127	Grant	259	Sherman
039	Burbank	135	Hamilton	267	Stockton
055	Carson	149	Horton	283	Valencia Park
059	Central	157	Johnson	287	Washington
		159	Jones		

SECONDARY

Loc. #	School	Loc. #	School	Loc. #	School
302	Bell	344	Lincoln	352	Morse
335	Gompers	315	Memorial	356	San Diego
365	Keiller	316	Montgomery	329	Wilson

2. Teachers: For blocks 4 and 5, choose the numbers from the list below which best designate your class level. If you are teaching at two grade levels, use either grade level. Blacken the corresponding circles below the numbers.

Number	Grade	Number	Grade	Number	Grade
00	Kindergarten	07	Grade 7, Social Studies/ Reading	11	Grade 9, Social Studies/ Reading
01	Grade 1				
02	Grade 2				
03	Grade 3	08	Grade 7 or 8, Mathematics	12	Grade 9, Mathematics
04	Grade 4				
05	Grade 5	09	Grade 7 or 8, English Language	13	Grade 10, Mathematics
06	Grade 6				
		10	Grade 8, Science/Reading	14	Grade 9 or 10, English Language

3. Teachers: In the box numbered "6" enter:

"1" if you are in an elementary school and using DISTAR in any class.
"2" if you are teaching any elements (math, reading, etc.) of the Spanish AGP curriculum.
"3" if you are teaching a pilot.
"4" if you belong to none of the above categories.

4. Resource Teachers: If you are a resource teacher, choose the number below which correctly identifies your position and enter that number in boxes 1 - 4. Fill in the circles below the numbers.

5016 - Resource Teacher, Elementary: English Program
5017 - Resource Teacher, Elementary: Spanish Program
5018 - Resource Teacher, Junior High School
5019 - Resource Teacher, Senior High School

5. Administrators: If you are an administrator (Principal or Vice Principal), enter the correct number from below in the first four boxes.

5026 - Administrator, Elementary School
5027 - Administrator, Junior High School
5028 - Administrator, Senior High School

6. All Respondents: In box number 9, enter the number of years that you have been teaching or associated with the AGP curriculum: 1, 2, 3, or 4. Fill in the proper circle containing the number.

7. For each item of the survey, indicate your evaluation of the item by choosing a number from 1 to 5 which best expresses your evaluation. On the scale, 5 is high and 1 is low. Darken the circle on the answer sheet for that number item which corresponds to your evaluation of the item.

8. Use the clear space on the front and back of the answer sheet to make comments. Do not write in the green areas and do not write in the areas provided for item responses. Where possible, key your comments to survey questions by numbering the comments with the question number.

1/24/84

AGE

SURVEY

A G P SURVEY

1. Have you been clearly and specifically apprised that you may express creativity and innovation in carrying out the Achievement Goals Program (henceforth referred to as AGP)?

   Not apprised 1 2 3 4 5 Specifically and clearly apprised

2. How has AGP affected the relationship (interaction) between you and your students?

   Detracted from the relationship 1 2 3 4 5 Enhanced the relationship

3. In AGP is there enough time for application of learning?

   Insufficient time 1 2 3 4 5 Sufficient time

4. To what degree is the site AGP Resource Teacher essential to the carrying out of the program?

   Not essential 1 2 3 4 5 Most essential

5. To what degree are the AGP site-stationed substitute teachers essential to the program? (If not applicable to your situation, do not respond.)

   Not essential 1 2 3 4 5 Most essential

6. How essential is it that the site principal be an instructional leader for AGP?

   Not essential 1 2 3 4 5 Most essential

7. Since beginning instruction of the program, how have your views of AGP changed?

   Become more negative 1 2 3 4 5 Become more positive

8. What percent of your students are able to take advantage of the extension materials?

   1 (0-19%) 2 (20-39%) 3 (40-59%) 4 (60-79%) 5 (80-100%)

9. In what percent of the units are these students able to progress to the extension materials?

   1 (0-19%) 2 (20-39%) 3 (40-59%) 4 (60-79%) 5 (80-100%)

10. How has AGP affected your expectations of your students' progress?

    Decreased expectations 1 2 3 4 5 Increased expectations

11. How often has your principal (or vice-principal) been into your classroom to observe your implementation of AGP?

1(1 or less times/yr) 2(2 times) 3(3 times) 4(4 times) 5(more than 5 times/yr)

12. After being observed by your principal or vice-principal, how often do you receive feedback on program implementation in your classroom?

1 (0-19%) 2 (20-39%) 3 (40-59%) 4 (60-79%) 5 (80-100%)

13. After the site AGP resource teacher has made a classroom visitation, how often do you receive feedback on program implementation?

1 (0-19%) 2 (20-39%) 3 (40-59%) 4 (60-79%) 5 (80-100%)

14. According to your perceptions, what is the level of your principal's belief in and expectations for the Achievement Goals Program in teaching basic skills to the students of your school?

Very low level of expectations 1 2 3 4 5 Very high level of expectations

15. How effectively does your principal show his/her commitment to AGP?

Not effectively 1 2 3 4 5 Very effectively

16. Were you able to improve the amount of time you are able to devote weekly to science, social studies, and health this year compared to last year? (Elementary teachers only.)

No improvement 1 2 3 4 5 Substantial improvement

17. Were you able to improve the amount of time available for music, art, and/or applied arts this year compared to last year? (Elementary teachers only.)

No improvement 1 2 3 4 5 Substantial improvement

18. Are you satisfied with the revision carried out on the Spanish AGP Reading/Language Arts materials? (Omit if not applicable to your teaching assignment.)

Not satisfied 1 2 3 4 5 Quite satisfied

19. Do you perceive that there is need for further revision of the Spanish AGP Reading/Language Arts materials? (Omit if not applicable to your teaching assignment.)

Needed 1 2 3 4 5 Not needed

20. Do you perceive that there is need for further revision of the Spanish AGP Math materials? (Omit if not applicable to your teaching assignment.)

Needed 1 2 3 4 5 Not needed

21. Are you satisfied with the addition of the alternate lowered-readability worksheets for English Language Arts, Grades 4-6? (Omit if not applicable to your teaching assignment.)

Not satisfied 1 2 3 4 5 Quite satisfied

22. Is it your opinion that the addition of the Language Lead-up activities, Grades 1-6, are essential to a comprehensive language arts program? (Omit if not applicable to your teaching assignment.)

Not essential 1 2 3 4 5 Most essential

23. To what extent do you feel that AGP provides for practice and application of the higher level cognitive (thinking) skills?

Very limited extent 1 2 3 4 5 To a great extent

24. How essential are the AGP aides in carrying out the program?

Not essential 1 2 3 4 5 Most essential

25. AGP is a remedial program for low achieving students.

Highly agree 1 2 3 4 5 Highly disagree

26.-28. AGP is a superior program in reading, language, and math, providing intensive instruction in the basic skills while allowing leeway for teacher professionalism, creativity by students and teachers, and stimulating higher-level cognitive and intellectual skills:

26. In READING:
Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally agree

27. In LANGUAGE:
Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally agree

28. In MATH:
Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally agree

29. For inservice prior to the start of the school year, do you prefer inservice at the school site provided by site personnel or at a central location provided by district personnel?

1 (Pre-school inservice at the school site provided by site personnel and resources.)

2 (Pre-school inservice at a central location provided by district personnel.)

THE REMAINING FOUR ITEMS ARE TO BE ANSWERED BY PRINCIPALS, VICE-PRINCIPALS, AND RESOURCE TEACHERS ONLY.

30. To what degree are central AGP personnel essential to the implementation of the Achievement Goals Program (those people who coordinate the program and solve problems at the District level: does not include curriculum development personnel, as in reading and math)?

Not essential 1 2 3 4 5 Most essential

31. To what degree are central curriculum personnel essential to the implementation of the Achievement Goals Program (those people who write, edit, and rewrite the curriculum materials or supervise such activities)?

Not essential 1 2 3 4 5 Most essential

32. How reliable are the services of the central staff who are responsible for filling orders for AGP materials?

Not reliable 1 2 3 4 5 Most reliable

33. How useful have Concept-Cluster Analysis, CTBS, materials been to your school's efforts to improve basic skills?

Limited usefulness 1 2 3 4 5 Very useful

BEST COPY

GENERAL PURPOSE—80

IDENTIFICATION

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

NAME LAST NAME FIRST

USE NUMBER TWO PENCIL ONLY NO BALL POINT OR FELT TIP PENS

FOLD HERE FOR MAILING

	Y	N					Y	N				
1	1	2	3	4	5	21	1	2	3	4	5	
2	1	2	3	4	5	22	1	2	3	4	5	
3	1	2	3	4	5	23	1	2	3	4	5	
4	1	2	3	4	5	24	1	2	3	4	5	
5	1	2	3	4	5	25	1	2	3	4	5	
6	1	2	3	4	5	26	1	2	3	4	5	
7	1	2	3	4	5	27	1	2	3	4	5	
8	1	2	3	4	5	28	1	2	3	4	5	
9	1	2	3	4	5	29	1	2	3	4	5	
10	1	2	3	4	5	30	1	2	3	4	5	
11	1	2	3	4	5	31	1	2	3	4	5	

FOLD HERE FOR MAILING

	Y	N					Y	N				
12	1	2	3	4	5	32	1	2	3	4	5	
13	1	2	3	4	5	33	1	2	3	4	5	
14	1	2	3	4	5	34	1	2	3	4	5	
15	1	2	3	4	5	35	1	2	3	4	5	
16	1	2	3	4	5	36	1	2	3	4	5	
17	1	2	3	4	5	37	1	2	3	4	5	
18	1	2	3	4	5	38	1	2	3	4	5	
19	1	2	3	4	5	39	1	2	3	4	5	
20	1	2	3	4	5	40	1	2	3	4	5	

DS 1144

APPENDIX B

General Comments by Elementary and Secondary Respondents

1983-84 AGP SURVEY
General Comments by Elementary Respondents

General

"A.G.P. has eliminated a lot of work running off papers, etc. I think it is a GREAT program. It is too bad we have to change books next year. A complete waste of materials!!"

"TO ANY AND ALL THAT MIGHT HAVE ACCESS TO THIS SURVEY: First, let me say that I VERY MUCH dislike filling out a 1-2-3-4-5 type survey as that means you must answer the entire question with a positive or negative reply - and there is no way to give a reply to parts of the question. Because of this I feel I must clarify my answers - or give answers to parts of the questions instead of one answer for the whole.

Second, there is a good deal of difference in the K AGP reading program and the K AGP math program. In a survey such as this, it is really necessary to put the two programs in separate questions, otherwise it is impossible to give an accurate evaluation.

Third, I would like to mention that probably a survey has greater validity if it is indeed private - but there has not been much care taken to assure the privacy of these surveys - especially when we must note the location on the form.

Nevertheless, my peers at my site know my views, as do my principal and resource teacher so I am not expressing views for the first time."

"The pacing is far too fast in certain content areas. Also too little time on student 'critical thinking skills'".

"Next to DISTAR, AGP is the worst thing that could have been done to the children & creative caring teachers. It was written with the expectation that the kids (1) cannot learn like others, (2) are not as intellectually able as others, (3) should not learn to think creatively or independently.

True, some teachers have not decided fully that they are in charge of their classroom. However, some of us are in control of the discipline, some of us are even intelligent enough to be creative & determine what is needed in the learning process. Some of us already know what to say. (We don't need a script). Most of all, some of us want to be involved with the kids & the learning process. AGP is good for those who want to remain detached.

The children are bored, thinking less, less creative, less independent, & as poorly behaved. I am bored, frustrated, stagnated and ANGRY."

"I think AGP is great! It has helped me become more organized, more goal-oriented, make better use of my time, and the greatest benefit has been the noticeable progress of the children. Since there is a high transiency rate in AGP schools, it is easier to place a new child into the program because he/she is familiar with it."

"I am a Special Day Class Teacher, 4/5/6. This program at level 3 has worked excellently for my students with built-in review. I do not do C.B.T.S. testing."

"Children are bored. We have forgotten that one method of teaching is not always the best for all. Evidence is very strong that we (teachers) need to vary our styles of delivery to provide the best instruction. In AGP we forgot this. Much of the program is valuable and should be used as a starting point for teaching any subject.

Some specifics: -Worksheets are too long - seems like a lot of busy work at times.
-This is not Mastery Learning as developed by Bloom--that program is individualized - recent research shows that attempts to implement Mastery Learning in groups is failing.
-I am disturbed by the teaching that occurs because of the grouping. There is evidence we are doing this with our H, M, L groupings for classes.
-If I had more time I would expound further. There is a real need to look at what we have been doing."

"AGP sub is never on site. Pacing is too strict for some topics taught--no freedom to practice plays in reading books."

"At this school interruptions during AGP teaching time are numerous daily that run the gambit of intercom announcements about fire drills, unexpected assemblies, expected assemblies canceled and sometimes 15 minutes later re-announced they are on-schedule, unexpected mtgs. for teachers and separate ones for aides, inclement weather changes for recess & lunch, counseling center often not staffed 'so don't send anyone' - popcorn, pencil, picture sales, request for tallies, fire drills, many written notes daily requesting immediate feedback to administration, counseling, fellow teachers, aides, etc. In addition to that, over 80% of my students are in various pull-out programs daily; some in 2 and 3 programs daily. Thus, the "door swings open and closed" all day long.

Over 80% of my students at this grade level are still at the phonetical sound

level of reading instruction. All the above interferes with their instructional needs for an uninterrupted and quieter learning environment. Low scores are the result in the areas where critical hearing of sounds was necessary: spelling, language, vowels, consonant, and blends. A number of times the intrusion alarm system remained on after student arrival, as long as 45 min., even following repeated requests to turn it off (students complained of ear pain)."

"I have negative feelings about A.G.P. math and language because the answers are frequently incorrect."

"We would like a permanent AGP sub. assigned to our school."

"Please note that in my bilingual transitional classroom, I am teaching Distar and Spanish AGP reading.

The time restraints in a bilingual classroom make it very difficult to accomplish everything, even with AGP. The extras are definitely missing. There never is enough time."

"Main objection to AGP reading: (1) Assigning the publishers' levels for 'high achievers' as the grade level norm and being required to put this on report cards. (2) Cum tests at grade level even if child knows only limited English. We are teaching these children how to fail !"

Language Arts/Reading

"AGP READING - too many skills, not enough direct comprehension questions."

"Pacing of Reading & Language is still too fast . Reading pacing should be 3 days to adequately & creatively cover all material."

"Language program, while excellent, does not leave a lot of time for application & creativity."

"Kindergarten Language Program is really inappropriate. It stifles any creative, flexible, independent teaching time for the teacher. The continual emphasis on nouns, verbs, etc. is overextended, and really seems a waste of time. When these children are so locked into daily AGP math and reading, then to compound that with a stringent language program--there is no time for kids

to be kids! There is no time for free expression, oral lang. improvement, poetry, music, art, drama, social interaction, feelings, etc. and the wealth of things teachers have and can teach according to class need, rather than district mandate.

Pacing demands cause a lot of stress--from the district to the administrators, to the teachers, and then onto the students. We try to do the best we can for the students' welfare & education, but pressure can cause us to push them beyond what they're ready for, causing them to feel badly about themselves--and that's what education is supposed to be concerned with: children's success in school, not failure, and feeling good about themselves, meeting their needs. There needs to be some flexibility, and room for teacher judgement.

Spanish reading/lang. program requires 6 - 15 min. rotations. I went to an inservice where 6 kindergarten bilingual teachers were all saying how that was too many rotations and too much seatwork and not enough time for important kindergarten needs...and you only minor changes or allowances were made.

My particular and great concern is the Kindergarten AGP. Unfortunately, what they are losing, how all the stress or constant test-taking, demands of pacing, no/little time for expression, enjoyment, etc., cannot be measured on rising test scores!"

"I would like to have more readable worksheets in the first grade language worksheets."

"I like AGP reading as I feel it does challenge the students and requires a lot of concentration from them recalling facts, pg. #s, complete sentences, etc. I like how the skills are taught in one unit & retaught again & again. I think the pacing is too fast for my below grade level students & I teach 1/2 lesson a day. I do believe it lacks opportunity for the students as well as teachers to think very creatively but with my below grade level students they really have to know the basics first.

I have mixed feelings about language. The reading is too hard for my below grade level kids but the concepts taught are good. The pacing is good & lessons short & to the point."

"The language tests are real good. I think that it's real hard to get the warm-up drill and 2 groups in the time allotted."

Math

"I teach Advanced Math 5-6, in which survey tests are the only AGP materials, so many of the questions are not relevant to me."

"I'm extremely pleased with the AGP math program - my class is progressing beautifully and I feel good about the lessons given. I especially like the pacing given, and the homework, extension and reinforcement materials. I do feel the children are getting good conceptual and cognitive skills. I find the preparation needed for each lesson sometimes quite time consuming though. But time saved from running off dittoes, etc. can be used to make manipulatives. I hope the AGP program can be utilized in future years. There has been some terrific input to get the materials we have. I appreciate it!"

"I feel the Unit Tests in Math are too easy. I feel in Math there should be more drill on basic facts."

"I enjoy teaching AGP math. I feel it has been the best Kindergarten program

I'm familiar with.

I feel accumulative quarter test is not needed if a test is given at the end of each unit. Children do not learn while taking a test. I do not like giving the cum test, after I have already tested the student on that material with the unit test."

"I feel the A.G.P. math program is the best I have seen for my grade level."

"The AGP math program is an excellent program for elementary boys and girls. The pacing was very good, and the classroom teacher could be creative and have freedom to choose material that would enhance his/her program."

"I am piloting the Scott, Foresman Math for the first grade. I had greater success with the AGP Math program. The students had a very good understanding of the concepts and we covered more with AGP Math. The students are confused with the methods used in the Scott, Foresman and are not having the success that we had with AGP Math. I would prefer to return to the AGP Math. We had a great deal of success with that program."

"The first quarter in first grade Math is below the need of even "low" first graders."

"I do not like the AGP Math at all! I think it is paced way too fast. There is way too much cut and paste stuff & not enough drill & homework practice. I firmly believe after teaching 2nd grade Math 3-1/2 years that 2nd graders need to learn their (1) basic facts, (2) adding with regrouping (carrying), (3) subtracting w/regrouping (borrowing) & (4) intro. to multiplication. There should be constant drill & taught in the above order. Anything else is icing on the cake."

1983-84 AGP SURVEY
General Comments by Secondary Respondents

General

"I have grown to appreciate the offerings of AGP as the year has progressed. I strongly feel that class size needs to be limited to 15-20 maximum if improvement is to be achieved. Otherwise there is no time for individual help. "I also feel that AGP is really only necessary for low-level achievers. Average students or advanced students are held back."

"I see a need for at least 2 different classes. One for AGP low achievers and one for average and advanced."

"This survey is as unclear as much of the AGP material is. This is unclear clap-trap designed to make the program look good somewhere. It does not deserve to look good."

Language Arts/Reading

"I am currently using the vocabulary program only (first 5 minutes). My answers would be quite different were I to use the whole language arts program."

"I feel very strongly that the Rally program is successful not only in improving basic reading skills but also in elevating self-concept. I hope the district plans to keep it as part of the 7th grade curriculum."

"More t.a. time would be helpful."

"I feel that the AGP 9th Grade Reading/Social Studies program needs considerable revision. As it exists, it doesn't teach either reading or social studies very well."

"COMMENTS ON THE AGP/LANGUAGE ARTS QUESTIONNAIRE: While it may be hard to quantify what I am about to say in terms of statistical analysis, I must point out some of the hidden agendas in the AGP/LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM.

Try as you might, it is very hard, if not impossible, to be creative when you're placed in a straight jacket. True, you have loosened the jacket from last year's constant monitoring, impossible pacing, and stringent lesson plans, but you have not given us complete freedom to create, nor have you given the students the freedom to be truly creative. No matter how you slice it, AGP/LANGUAGE ARTS is a sterile, insipid program. I'm still asking, "Where's the

beef?" It is NOT a superior program in reading and language. It does NOT provide intensive instruction in the basic skills while allowing leeway for teacher professionalism, creativity by students and teachers. And it definitely does NOT stimulate higher cognitive and intellectual skills. It doesn't even stimulate cognitive and intellectual skills, let alone higher cognitive and intellectual skills.

In my estimation, it is still a remedial program for low achieving students. Students who have learned basic skills--grammar and composition--go through this program like gang-busters. It is very boring for the middle to upper level students in the class who would be challenged by assignments that would stimulate higher level cognitive and intellectual skills. If you can remember back three or four years ago, you will recall that the program was primarily put in place to raise test scores of students in the minority isolated schools. It was supposed to be an answer to the court mandate to raise test scores.

'It is raising test scores,' you say proudly. If the program has indeed raised test scores, it is only because students have become more test conscious, not more skilled. They are pros when it comes to test format. They don't seem to write any better. They don't seem to speak any better. If the discrete learning that goes on to prepare students for mastery test does not improve oral and written communication, then we, as educators, have defeated our purpose. Sure, the test scores may be improving, but students may still be illiterate.

Grading is another drawback to the program. I know you did not address this in your questionnaire, but it needs to be brought up anyway. The AGP department is fostering and promoting poor skills and even illiteracy in setting grade standards. Students can pass the course (D- is passing) if they do very little daily work (D), pass mastery tests in the English Skills Center (they get a "C" on the mastery tests regardless of how many times they have to take a particular test before they manage to pass it), and absolutely complete no product at all (F). These students would be rewarded with a D- and would be passed on to the next grade. Ridiculous! Absurd! You are perpetuating the idea of limited skills and even illiteracy. I say students should not pass unless they can demonstrate through oral and written mediums that they are indeed competent and proficient.

And that's the way I see the AGP/Language Arts program on April 9, 1984."

"AGP in Reading Development has interesting and often well-constructed units. As a result of the students studying the News Unit, many of them look forward to the delivery of the weekly Thursday's paper. Some have related that they have never received such at home and others tell about their reading only in a specific area, such as the sport section. Now they look through just about all of the sections, discuss and share current events, compare the daily paper with weekly tabloids and, often, look for articles to clip out for other classes.

The Author, Mood, Tone Unit offered them some important challenges; however, the

students were able to reinforce information previously encountered but not too much noticed. They had a lot of fun with the figurative language unit; it encouraged their creative energy.

The students agree that strengthening of life skills is important, especially in the areas of guarantees, warranties, and contracts. They were quite vocal about this unit.

Overall, the experiment in A.G.P. has helped to bring to attention some areas of learning which might be overlooked in a period of reinforcemenmt in regular English classes."

"I am teaching a Reading Development 11-12 class. We do not have extension materials available from the district. Instead we develop on-site materials and opportunities. Part of the "problem" with AGP Reading 10-12 at our site has been teacher turnover. Also and unfortunately, I think some of the teachers see AGP classes as the easy way out (i.e. all lesson plans are provided for them, etc.) and they do not bring much innovation, added resources and creativity to the class. It seems AGP classes have attracted and/or produced "lazy" teachers. Because of this, other more creative teachers shy away from teaching these classes. There needs to be a change in perception of the program and a recruitment of more innovative, motivated and creative teachers. I have especially enjoyed teaching the AGP Reading 11-12 class this year because the pacing is very loose and we are free to add our own input and materials to those provided."

"*AGP does not allow for in-depth application of essential learning at the 8th grade review level.

*Students do not know parts of speech or basic sentence structure.

*Little time is available to address matters concerning literature, writing research papers or related composition. This is necessary for high school preparation.

*Products and tests are over-simplified.

*Most hand-outs for units are excellent sources of practice for students.

*Spelling and vocabulary are excellent programs. Vocabulary should be 10 words a week.

*I have created my own mini-units to fill in gaps in program."

Math

"I don't get to do as much individual work with students as I used to or as much as I would like.

There needs to be a middle math course at grades 7 & 8. There are a number of students for whom the regular math program is too easy but the adv. programs are much too difficult."

"I have 5 AGP classes and only 2 hours of aide time/day.

Support personnel at site take too long to call in students for reinforcement & retesting.

Once the students are reinforced only approx. 5% finally pass retakes.

I receive many, many passes during my classes.

There is a need for competent substitutes for AGP math as my classes do not progress on schedule when I'm out. So far this year my classes are behind at least 6 days due to my being absent."

"General comments: The program is not essential in teaching Geometry.

Pacing schedules could be promulgated as well as other desired goals.

The elements of the Program cannot overcome the impediments in the attitudes prevalent.

I foresee considerable difficulties when standards are imposed to grant credit for the class and doubt that this action will be implemented due to other reactions."

"A translation into Spanish of the AGP ADV MATH 7, 8, & 9 is strongly needed."

"I teach Basic Alg I & II and don't feel that this survey applies directly to my classes."

1983-84

Administrator/Resource Teacher Responses

"The pacing schedule seems a bit too rigid at times especially for grades 4-6 where we lose one week of instruction to allow for implementation of the integration programs but where we also lose additional time for required pre and post activities for each of the programs.

Pacing needs to insure adequate time at the beginning of the school year to allow time for teachers to develop guidelines with their classes for effective classroom management."

"Advanced Math materials need to be translated."

"AGP math does not allow for student placement advancement. One has to keep students on grade level."

APPENDIX C

Comments by Item

1983-84 AGP SURVEY
Comments by Item

Questions

Question 1: Have you been clearly and specifically apprised that you may express creativity and innovation in carrying out the Achievement Goals Program (henceforth referred to as AGP)?

Answer: I have been specifically told that I can express creativity in this one area: I may substitute a worksheet that I have made for an AGP worksheet, as long as I am teaching the same concept. As far as innovation - I have definitely been led to understand that I was NOT to change the program for any innovations even if I might think they are utterly fantastic. Those that have come under that category I have sent to _____ when I had time (some never got sent).

This year, in desperation, I did want to make a slight change in the Reading AGP, Unit 3. I had to first talk to both my resource teacher and principal, and wait a few days in order to get permission to make the change. I made the change, the results were excellent; my innovation had worked for me! But I had felt absolutely no freedom to just go ahead and do that on my own.

Answer: Only this year--but difficult to carry out with rigid pacing.

Answer: AGP #10 should not affect expectations. Expectations should be high with AGP making it easier to reach these expectations.

Answer: How can you with such rigid pacing?

Question 2: How has AGP affected the relationship (interaction) between you and your students? (Detracted from or enhanced the relationship?)

Answer: I don't feel AGP has affected my relationship with students in any way.

Answer: The Spanish AGP program should not be revised. There should be an all out effort to adopt a single text with adaptation as was done in English with H.M.

Answer: Students with limited abilities have a very difficult time adjusting to and completing assignments, i.e. finding page numbers for answers to Worksheets eventually with much help, prodding, etc. get into the pattern and work habits, but it is a struggle for months.

Question 3: In AGP is there enough time for application of learning?

Answer: Inservice conducted by district personnel seem to give an added

emphasis to the importance of the program. Site inservice should be follow up.

Question 4: To what degree is the site AGP Resource Teacher essential to the carrying out of the program?

Answer: I imagine that AGP resource teachers are expensive, and yet much of the paperwork they do could certainly be done by a trained aide - or, better yet, have the teachers photocopy pacing charts and send them to a central location. Unless the resource teacher has time to WORK WITH THE CHILDREN (and ours does not) then I see no value to the expense. If I had a 2 hr. aide in my room during reading, it would be cheaper and more profitable for my children and my reading program, than the present arrangement. Perhaps some of that wealth of skill should be used in writing and evaluating the present program.

Answer: The AGP Resource Teacher is an important part of the program. It is an essential job to help coordinate the distribution of the materials & key messages for AGP implementation.
I do feel, however, the AGP Resource Teacher has not been as helpful in the dissemination of the Bilingual/Spanish AGP Program. There is not adequate storage for all AGP Spanish & Eng. components. I feel there needs to be someone who understands the needs of both programs.

Answer: Resource teacher at site is essential for the AGP English program, but can't assist me thoroughly in the Spanish AGP.

Answer: The AGP site resource teacher is as essential as my right arm: Remove my right arm and I still function but not to the degree I would with a right arm. The site AGP resource teacher makes it function.

Answer: We don't have an AGP Resource Teacher.

Answer: AGP Resource Teacher on site has too many responsibilities for one person. More than one AGP resource teacher is needed on site, fulltime.

Answer: Very imp. to get by .

Answer: We do not have an AGP Resource Teacher on site.

Answer: AGP Resource Teacher is most indispensable in the area of paper work that we on the site have no use for.

Answer: Ordering, organizing, and delivering supplies (AGP) to the classroom could be done by an aide. I see no reason to employ a certificated person for this clerical type position.

Answer: _____/_____ have been extremely helpful and supportive to the teaching staff: they not only keep tabs on the supplies, but they are also instrumental in maintaining our achievement levels/standards.

Question 5: To what degree are the AGP site-stationed substitute teachers <u>essential</u> to the program?

Answer: Our AGP substitute teachers are <u>not</u> Spanish speaking, so they are not used in the AGP Bilingual classrooms. And the substitutes that are sent from the "list" aren't either, in most cases--hence, the children lose out on a day of appropriate instruction.

Answer: I think this is very valuable to the AGP program. It provides a continuituy to the program, so it continues to be implemented as it should. *I think some schools should be provided with 2 AGP subs, where there is a higher rate of absenteeism among certificated personnel.

Answer: The site subs are not always available even though I teach AGP.

Answer: It would be much better if he/she were on the campus <u>daily.</u>

Answer: The AGP substitute is a big plus to the AGP program.

Answer: Recently placed elsewhere but is needed--

Answer: Never enough substitutes especially in the bilingual areas.

Answer: Our sub is <u>seldom</u> on site--usually somewhere else. If the sub is to be effective he/she should be on site every day.

Answer: I have probably been absent only 7 or 8 days in the three years, but on only one of these days was the AGP sub available for my classroom. So - there goes that help! A wonderful idea, but totally impractical (also expensive).

Answer: We would like to have a site stationed sub.

Answer: I have found AGP subs to be the most dedicated, well-trained, thorough group of individuals ever avaivable to me in any sub pool. They are also a <u>very</u> enthusiastic group of individuals.

Answer: We'd like to try one.

Answer: Very imp. to get <u>by</u>

Question 6: How essential is it that the site principal be an <u>instructional leader</u> for AGP?

Answer: This is a difficult question to answer unless I clearly understand what you mean by an instructional leader. If the principal has to be a leader as to what instruction goes on in an AGP classroom, then something is wrong with the teacher/program, not the principal.

Answer: I feel the principals can gain tremendous insight, sensitivity and empathy for the teacher's tasks, which improves teacher/principal rapport. I really like to see them utilizing their

teacher skills again.

Answer: Our principal is not an instructional leader for AGP--instead our principal is an administrator, not a lead teacher. All sites should have lead teachers.

Answer: What is there to do that involves any leadership?...unless program can be substituted with better quality? Certainly AGP gives little time to reading, speaking and writing--hardly enough--to do justice to those skills under AGP. Resource does not seem to be able to change aspects, AGP now seems cemented regardless of its worth--as long as CTBS is satisfied.

Answer: Would like to see the site administrators teach AGP groups so they could better understand the process and problems. Would make for more meaningful evaluations on their part. Would have to assume the level of support is high, after all AGP is a mandated program. Never seen any evidence however as principal & v. prin. have never done anything in my classroom but observe.

Question 7: Since beginning instruction of the program, how have your views of AGP changed?

Answer: It is impossible to answer this question for both K math and K reading. For K Math, a 4 or 5; for K Reading, a 1.

Answer: Applies to reading only. Language - taken straight from text. Waste of Money .

Answer: It varies with the approach of the principal/res. tchr. If they insist that everything be to the letter & exact pacing - it's a ridiculous program. If they realize that children are not robots & that groups of children vary--then it can be reasonable & positive. I've been in both situations.

Answer: It is useful [illegible] supplying home work for the students (which is ridiculous for Kindergartners).

Answer: I have come to the conclusion that any decently designed program will work if the teacher is committed and competent.

Answer: I was unsure about the program before using it and now I see such great results in my room with AGP.

Answer: AGP Math is very good. AGP Reading builds in a dislike of reading--regardless of "scores" which are not education, but we teach for tests & ignore the needs of slower learning children.

Question 8: What percent of your students are able to take advantage of the extension material?

Answer: Questions 8 & 9 are poor questions. Almost all have an opportunity for at least one or two extensions--some always have extension.

Answer: I am not aware of any such materials for my program.

Answer: My class consists largely of ESL and lower achieving students.

Answer: Depending on the subject area, more in Math & Reading.

Answer: When 80 - 100% of the students pass the unit test, the extension materials are used as homework.

Answer: Extension materials are used as supplemental work or review, even if 100% of group passes the test first time. When less than 80% pass Test A, we follow standard re teach, ext., procedure.

Answer: There are only enough materials for half my class. I end up Thermo-faxing all the materials; or just using them with the top half of the group. There should be a full set of extension sheets.

Answer: All my students do extension regardless of test performance. They all need stretching!! (This applies to Question 9 as well).

Question 9: What percent of the units are these students able to progress to the extension materials?

Answer: My class consists largely of ESL and lower achieving students.

Question 10: How has AGP affected your expectations of your students' progress?

Answer: Decreases toward realism.

Question 11: How often has your principal (or vice-principal) been into your classroom to observe your implementation of AGP?

Answer: I resent being observed on "my implementation of AGP". That sounds like appraising a machine or "road testing a car". Anybody can watch a clock and start and stop at the correct time - but it takes a TEACHER to turn time into creative learning. Please, please, observe me for:

my teaching techniques,
my relationships with students,
the progress of my students in relation to their ability,
the "feeling" you get when in my classroom (are kids actively involved in learning, regardless of what time it is)

and not for my daily schedule.
Please check my results - not my pacing charts!!

Answer: I've only been in the classroom 2 mos.

Answer: This yr., new principal's been in 8 times as part of Stull Obj. Last 3 years, maybe 2 or 3 times a year.

Answer: As to Questions 11 and 12, our principal stays on top of everything that we teach and visits our classrooms with formal evaluations 2 times a month. This is helpful.

Question 12: After being observed by your principal or vice-principal, how often do you receive feedback on program implementation in your classroom?

Answer: Thank goodness, my principal gives me lots of feedback about my entire program, not just "program implementation".

Question 13: After the site AGP resource teacher has made a classroom visitation, how often do you receive feedback on program implementation?

Answer: I find questions 12 & 13 to be extremely difficult to answer in that the definition of "feedback" can be defined in so many ways. If you mean that THEY commend me for being on the right day of the pacing schedule, then yes, I get feedback. But if you mean that they have any idea what is actually being taught, the creativity and innovation I bring to the program or how the students are reacting to the program, then no, I get no feedback.

Answer: I sure hope you realize the difference between a teacher's feedback & a Principal's!

Answer: The feedback from the resource teacher almost always concerns where I am on pacing (3 days ahead, 4 days behind, "right on"). I already know that - so again an aide could tell me that. I need someone to help me with the little guy that just can't understand a difficult concept; maybe even taking the little fellow aside and giving him some one-to-one help for a few sessions.

Answer: ___ ___/___ _____ have been extremely helpful and supportive to the teaching staff--they not only keep tab on the supplies, but they are also instrumental in maintaining our achievement levels/standards.

Answer: The quality of the feedback is very poor & not worthwhile.

Question 14: What is the level of expectation shown by your principal for the success of the Achievement Goals Program in teaching basic skills to the students of your school?

and

Question 15: What is the level of your principal's support for the Achievement Goals Program?

Answer: Numbers 14 & 15 are true only if the students transfer their learning of basic skills to improve test scores (CTBS).

Answer: In math, AGP, principal is very supportive but we are involved in Distar rdg. lang. & splg. He is also very supportive of those tchrs. wishing to supplement lang. w/AGP language.

Question 16: Were you able to improve the amount of time you are able to devote weekly to science, social studies, and health this year compared to last year?

and

Question 17: Were you able to improve the amount of time available for music, art, and/or applied arts this year compared to last year?

Answer: Lang. program take more time.

Answer: More because of too many students with learning & behavioral problems. (I had done much better last year than the 1st 2 years).

Answer: There is time for science and art, "even" with AGP!! I really feel it is a myth, propagated largely (but not entirely) by poor management, that AGP affords no times for the arts or sciences. While it is true that time may be less, I feel that there are ways of fitting all subject matter in with AGP--within the AGP lesson itself, on test days, end of unit days, etc.

Answer: The Bilingual self-contained room that participates in Magnet classes does not have adequate time for all subject areas--especially when there are several students in the transition period of beginning English Reading, Language & English Spelling skills. A priority must be set. Does the classroom balance the program or do those classes - Bilingual self-contained concentrate on Transition into English with Emphasis on Grammar, Language, Reading & Spelling?

Answer: Due to the closing of the Learning Centers (thereby dropping the necessity of double lessons in Math & Reading two days per wk.)

Answer: It is much more difficult to get to soc. studies, etc. due to the reading pilot and rigid pacing in reading.

Answer: Less time.

Answer: We have a longer day this year.

Answer: We got a music teacher--20 min. per week. That's lots more music than last year.

Question 18: Are you satisfied with the revision carried out on the Spanish AGP reading/Language Arts materials?

Answer: "There are too many concepts trying to be taught - History, Literature, Grammar, Vocab., Punctuation & Spelling. There is little in the area of Reading to work in the area of application. The history reading in Level D9 when used with grades 3 & 4 is far too difficult. Books fall apart because they are not hard bound as are those used in English. Separate the Language part & include vocabulary drill, such as warm ups."

Answer: "Revision of Spanish AGP Reading/Language Arts & Math is most definitely needed.

Units are not correlated unit by unit to those in English. Unit by unit vocabulary needs to be included in Spanish for a consistence of vocabulary (area of Math).

Math AGP materials seem to assume that a large percent of the class will not pass the Unit Test A by the fact that only 20 sheets of Extension Work Sheets are provided for each unit and an equal amount of Reteaching Work Sheets are provided. I suggest 30 Extension Sheets and 10 Reteaching Sheets per unit. In my experience this would be far more realistic and consistent with the success factor built into the program."

Answer: Not satisfied because I've received a mixture of revised & unrevised materials which often don't dovetail. That's disastrous.

Answer: I feel that spot revisions are needed--especially between level A-1/2 and A-3/4--beginning reading is pushed rather fast before children have had a chance to learn the new consonant to start making words. (I feel there is a gap between introduction of consonants and beginning reading).

Answer: I had a lot of concerns about last year's language program. I really like the alternate work sheets. Because of them my students seem to be reaching mastery more often. Why not teach outlining in Unit 6 - 4th grade? Reports should be organized with an outline. (This also applies to Question 19).

Answer: Kindergarten reading program introduces writing entire words too soon. Unit with "m" sound had a test with dictation of words and students had had little practice writing at that time. (This statement also applies to Question 19).

Answer: Complaint does not refer to the revisions per se, but to the fact that complete sets of revised materials were not being sent, i.e., old manuals with revised charts & worksheets, or

vice versa, etc. Question 19 refers directly to 18. At such time as complete sets of revised materials consistently arrive, then it will be possible to ascertain if further revisions are necessary.

Question 19: Do you perceive that there is need for further revision of the Spanish Reading/Language Arts materials?

Answer: It is appalling that essential revisions of the Spanish AGP program have not been carried out, especially in the Math. The math units don't even correlate w/the English creating that much more work for the bilingual teacher. As it is bilingual teachers do double of everything (in transition classrooms). We don't need another problem in our already full curriculum. Please revise Spanish materials!!!

Answer: As far as AGP Spanish Rdg/Lang--a lot of it is good; pacing is very useful to me BUT kids 5-6 yrs. old (levels A1/2 & A3/4) need bigger printing, etc. for reading-- some are developmentally not able to cut-paste-read such teeny stuff. Also there are entirely too many typos, omitted periods & capitals, etc. etc. etc.

Question 20: Do you perceive that there is need for further revision of the Spanish AGP Math materials?

Answer: I think guides should be printed in Spanish--teachers' remarks at least.

Answer: Teachers' manuals need to be translated into Spanish.

Answer: Only the guides have to be revised. They are too wordy. An outline form is a lot better.

Answer: Grade 5, Unit 6, Measurement--In Spanish or English, needs to be broken down into 2, or possibly 3, separate units. Too many different types of measurement are taught too close together and not enough time allowed for assimilation. Each year, students consistently do poorly in this unit, although doing well on others.

Answer: Need series sequential math lessons to individualize students to pass units 1 and 2.

Answer: Revision of Spanish AGP Reading/Language Arts & Math is most definitely needed.

Units are not correlated unit by unit to those in English. Unit by unit vocabulary needs to be included in Spanish for a consistence of vocabulary (area of Math).

Math AGP materials seem to assume that a large percent of the class will not pass the Unit Test A by the fact that only 20

sheets of Extension Work Sheets are provided for each unit and an equal amount of Reteaching Work Sheets are provided. I suggest 30 Extension Sheets and 10 Reteaching Sheets per unit. In my experience this would be far more realistic and consistent with the success factor built into the program."

Question 21: Are you satisfied with the addition of the alternate lowered-readability worksheets for English Language Arts, Grades 4-6?

Answer: They are vital to the program.

Answer: Fair--hard to follow; sometimes not applicable.

Answer: Don't know if applicable. I may have heard of them, been inserviced on them & forgotten or we call it something else. (This also applies to #22 & #24)

Answer: Not as good an idea as I hoped, if they still have to pass a normal-readability test.

Answer: I am not aware of any change in "readability" of Language worksheets.

Question 22: Is it your opinion that the addition of the Language Lead-up activities, Grades 1-6, are essential to a comprehensive language arts program?

Answer: Helpful but not essential.

Answer: Need extra time.

Answer: Marked higher for Houghton-Mifflin than I would for Ginn.

Answer: Not much evaluation.

Answer: This concerns me greatly since I have the G.A.T.E. class. Pacing is particularly restrictive to creativity and creates undue pressure on teachers of G.A.T.E.

Question 23: To what extent do you feel that AGP provides for practice and application of the higher level cognitive (thinking) skills?

Answer: Really--not at all.

Answer: For kindergarten the hands on approach needs more time rather than paper production.

Answer: Below level 11 Ginn, there's none, above 11, it's too drifty.

Question 24: How essential are the AGP aides in carrying out the program?

Answer: A capable Aide is essential in the assistance of instruction in AGP.

Answer: The program couldn't operate effectively without them!!!

Answer: Essential--but only if they are reliable, trained & effective.

Answer: Have to have aide or program would not work.

Answer: No AGP Aide available.

Answer: Aides need to be inserviced in: clear writing; careful correction of papers; show more initiative and willingness to do more than minimum job requirements. Good questioning skills, using careful, standard English. Most important--know how A.G.P. works. Be aware of how much work the classroom teacher is required to do--and aid the teacher. The students will benefit most when the aide is part of the team and cares.

Answer: I have not as yet received an aide.

Answer: There cannot be an AGP Kindergarten program without a classroom aide.

Answer: We have no AGP aide! I received 25 min. 4 days weekly from a bus aide. Not enough!

Answer: Without the aides in this program it would be impossible to have the time to present this much material and monitor the students.

Answer: This is a program that is not effective without aides. They help to make the program.

Answer: What is AGP Aide? Person who delivers supplies?

Answer: No aides are available in our building.

Answer: Aides help teachers maintain good disposition as continuous truckloads of paper are brought each month. They are definitely needed for all the nitty-gritty.

Answer: I only know of AGP subs which are highly essential to the progress of the daily pacing. Weren't mentioned.

Answer: Without one, paperwork wouldn't be possible.

Question 25: AGP is a remedial program for low achieving students.

Answer: I did not answer this question, as there is no answer. What were you trying to get me to say??? ANY program can be a remedial program for low achieving students - depending on how the teacher uses it. ANY program can also be an exciting, challenging program for high achieving students - IF the teacher is free to implement it, and IF the teacher will work to make it so.

Answer: AGP is not remedial. The reading is POORLY designed. Math is excellent.

Answer: I believe it is on this site and am not knowledgeable as to whether this was to be the sole purpose of the program at the outset.

Answer: Does not pertain. We have both advanced & remedial levels.

Answer: If #25 is not true, why are the AGP Reading Programs (grades 10-12) only in the lower achieving schools?

Answer: In theory it can meet the needs of all students but at the secondary level it has become a program for remedial students.

Answer: Despite protests from program developers and ideologies, AGP trains students via a misapplication of responsibility for learning from the student to the "system."

Question: 26, 27, 28 AGP is a superior program in reading, language, and math, providing intensive instruction in the basic skills while allowing leeway for teacher professionalism, creativity by students and teachers, and stimulating higher-level cognitive and intellectual skills:

In Reading?

Answer: Reading extension enrichment materials could be improved.

Answer: Creativity, & stimulating higher cognitive & intellectual skills need improving.

Answer: More written comprehension opportunities such as use of questions at end of stories.

Answer: Yes, because of flexibility in ability placement of student.

Answer: I feel that the Reading program lacks time in which to develop writing skills.

In Language?

Answer: Pacing allows for little to no time for creative writing.

Answer: The language program at Gr. 1 lacks sequenced skill building and creative application of the skill learned. The oral product is most ambiguous and difficult to assess. The written product does not seem to indicate skill mastery and the unit tests are too easy. The entire program is very poorly sequenced, dull and repetitive.

In Math?

Answer: I feel the AGP Math program is excellent--providing instruction in the basic skills. It provides ideas for teacher-made items & activities in the manual. A capable aide is essential in the assistance of instruction in AGP.

Answer: Despite protests from program developers and ideologies, AGP trains students via a misapplication of responsibility for learning from the student to the "system."

Answer: Thank you for the extension work packets!

Answer: I believe the following to be a TRUE statement: The AGP Math program is a superior program providing intensive instruction in the basic skills.

I have not seen the revised K Math program (but I sure would like to), so in the program I am using there are still some BAD worksheets, and some areas where we cannot allow time for the students to grow and develop and mature before testing a certain concept (ordinal numbers is a good example), but basically I feel it is an exceptional program. It has an excellent guide that keeps the teacher on her toes, especially in that it presents concepts a unit or two before you are actually using that concept and maintains a constant review of concepts taught. Someone has done a lot of good organizing for us! (when to introduce, teach, drill, review, reinforce, etc.)!

Answer: Metric unit leaves a lot to be desired. Should have kits for each teacher to use which includes objects in metric units.

Answer: The advanced math is excellent for high achievers and Gate.

Answer: AGP is so structured that there is very little time for anything else, including creativity. Excellent material, just no extra time. The measurement unit is too hard and too much is included in the amount of time given--there also needs to be all sorts of manipulative aids included with that unit.

Answer: I am really happy with the Math Inst., as far as methods, skills taught, etc., but I feel that some units are too short in length. I feel that the measurement unit should be lengthened by a few days.

Combined Answers to 26, 27 & 28

Answer: I feel that AGP is a superior and intensive program. I feel we should continue to work on leeway for professionalism and creativity.

Answer: The AGP Pacing Schedule is one element of the program that does not allow for professionalism or creativity. I find myself looking at the clock more often. Too much time and effort is spent on staying on pacing and not enough on teaching. Often more time is needed by students to comprehend a topic than the time that is allowed.

Answer: Teachers can be creative in using this program but often are not confident enough to do so.

Answer: The reading and math AGP is fine. I agree that the time with the teacher and constant assessment through unit testing is a great asset.

Answer: The program does not stimulate higher-level cognitive & intellectual skills. I, as the educator, do that. I have to plan them & integrate them into the curriculum.

Answer: The advanced units are great.

Answer: When we first heard about AGP, we were told that the program guaranteed success to or for the students. This is more or less the case in reading, but in language and math, where the child is forced to work at his own grade level, AGP means guaranteed failure in some cases. This is especially true in a combination-grade classroom, where there is little opportunity for fast-group/slow-group placement.

Question 29: For inservice prior to the start of the school year, do you prefer inservice at the school site provided by site personnel or at a central location provided by district personnel?

Answer: None at all.

Answer: In-service for what? At this point in time, do experienced teachers of AGP need help in in-service?

Answer: Prefer 2, but limit number of schools per session.

Answer: Start w/inschool motivational inservice early 2nd sem., districtwide.

Answer: Both are needed to take care of items peculiar to that site.

Question 30: To what degree are central AGP personnel essential to the implementation of the Achievement Goals Program (those people who coordinate the program and solve problems at the District level; does not include curriculum development personnel, as in reading and math)?

Answer: They do not listen to our objections to the reading program. Math people are very responsive to our criticism.

Answer: (Questions 30-32) You don't give me a space to mention the

mistakes made, especially in reading. There needs be a clear route to correct these errors.

Question 31: To what degree are central curriculum personnel essential to the implementation of the Achievement Goals Program (those people who write, edit, and rewrite the curriculum materials or supervise such activities)?

Answer: I can teach language from text without all the worksheets, etc.

Question 32: How/reliable/are the services of the central staff who are responsible for filling orders for AGP materials?

Answer: The supply center is not very reliable for filling orders for AGP materials.

Materials on backorders makes teaching impossible. It also hinders pacing.

Answer: Materials need to be on the site at least 2 weeks before the start of the new unit in order to:

1. Calm nerves of teachers who plan ahead.
2. Allow teachers time to secure needed supplies, resource materials.
3. Permit teachers to preview and study materials and enrich the lessons where needed.

Answer: The only 2 reliable central staff persons responsible for filling orders are _____ and _____. ICM very uncooperative & give you the impression they're doing you a favor. Ditto for computer operator _____.

Question 33: How useful have Concept-Cluster Analysis, CTBS, materials been to your school's efforts to improve basic skills?

Answer: If (this) is referring to the computer results regarding the C.T.B.S. I am very satisfied and find them very useful.

Answer: Cluster Analyses are helpful when the proper packages are sent to the correct school site. One should not have to hunt for the results.

Cluster Analysis cannot be reliable when errors are made on the individual information sheets. Example: Name of student and school site are incorrect.

Answer: Our school only had Gr. 5. Would dbe extremely valuable if we had them.

Answer: Only scored #2 because they were not used appropriately (little emphasis).

Answer: The Cluster analysis was very valuable in helping us to

work with students in the areas of weakness. Please continue to send.

Compiled:
BRD:nrl
6/5/84